UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

"Patriotism Is Not Enough"

By W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW

Why Moscow Was Indignant

By HENRY L. KINGMAN

Gandhi, Nehru, and Revolting India

By KIRBY PAGE

Francis Bacon and His "New Atlantis"

By DAVID GITTLEMAN

VOLUME CIV | NUMBER 18

Chicago, January 20, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Sidney Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Rogers, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes — Francis Neilson
Curtis W. Reese — Louis L. Mann

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is just completed.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 275
"Patriotism Is Not Enough"—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW 277
Jottings—J. H. H. 279

ARTICLES—

Why Moscow Was Indignant—HENRY L. KINGMAN 279
Gandhi, Nehru, and Revolting India—KIRBY PAGE 281
Francis Bacon and His "New Atlantis"—DAVID GITTLEMAN 283
Romain Rolland—Great Soul of France—*Robert Merrill Bartlett* 284

POETRY—

The Three-Fold Plan—*Bliss Carman* 275

THE STUDY TABLE—

Christianity Under Attack—JAMES H. FAIRLEY 285

CORRESPONDENCE—

Where Is the Publisher Who "Dares"?—JAMES H. WEST 286
The Administration and the Farmer—F. S. KINDER 286

THE FIELD—

The Social Note at the General Conference of the American Unitarian Association—GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON 287
Mark Sullivan on Wet and Dry Lobbies 288

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1930 NUMBER 18

THE THREE-FOLD PLAN

He who espouses perfection
Must follow the threefold plan
Of soul and mind and body,
To compass the stature of man.

Wherefore the triune dominion,—
Religion, science, and art,
We may not disrupt nor divide,
Setting its kingdoms apart.

But ever with glowing ardour
After the ancient plan,
Build the care and the rapture
Into the life of man.

—Bliss Carman.
from "The Making of Personality."

In our last week's issue of UNITY we made mention, as we shall make mention still again, of Mr. S. O. Levinson's *Christian Century* article on "The Sanctions of Peace." Mr. Levinson did two remarkable things in this article. In the first place, he showed that peace in general, and the Briand-Kellogg Treaty in particular, may have sanctions other than those of armies and navies, force and violence. In the second place, he illustrated what these sanctions may be by proposing four definite specimens of his own suggestion. One of these sanctions, the second, was a thrilling thing:

> *Any person, or persons, who shall advocate orally or in writing or cause the publication of any printed matter which shall advocate the use of war between nations, in violation of the terms of the Pact of Peace, with the intent of causing war between or among nations, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be imprisoned not less than ——— years.*

In this sanction is presented a knotty problem of free speech which, as a thoroughgoing advocate of civil liberties, we welcome for its challenge to rigorous thinking upon the question. But this at the moment is beside the point. What is significant here is the complete reversal achieved in world affairs by the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. In ages gone by the power of government has invariably been on the side of the militarist and thus against the pacifist. It is the peace-lover and not the war-maker who has been regarded as the enemy of the public safety, to be suppressed and silenced at any cost. Now the boot is on the other leg! It is the advocate of arms who is henceforth the traitor—the advocate of reconciliation and goodwill who is henceforth the patriot. This is a welcome change—and a change of such fundamental consequence as to usher in a new epoch of human history. Hugo Grotius put civilization upon a new and higher level when he proclaimed the laws of war. A greater than Grotius, Mr. S. O. Levinson, has lifted civilization to a still higher level by proclaiming the laws of peace.

Momentous events are rapidly taking place in India. So rapidly that before this editorial is printed its comments may be overwhelmed by stupendous events transpiring since it was written! At the moment the great event is the Lahore Congress, which may be destined to take its place in history along with the American Congress in 1776 which declared the independence of the thirteen colonies from British rule. At Lahore Mahatma Gandhi was again the supreme leader of the Indian people. At his suggestion, and under his guidance, the Congress abandoned the claim for dominion status within the Empire and declared for out-and-out national independence. At one of its sessions the President of the Congress, Mr. Nehru, lifted the national flag of India and pledged the assembled representatives of the people to recognize no other flag. Subsidiary to this great declaration were two other acts of the Congress. On the one hand, it refused to join in the forthcoming round-table conference called in London by the MacDonald government. On the other hand, it authorized the Congress's executive committee, of which Gandhi is a member, to start at its discretion a nation-wide non-cooperative campaign against British rule, thus pledging itself to the Mahatma's program of non-violence. Already the committee has announced non-cooperation with the local legislative councils, thus ending all political action under the Crown. Other steps will be taken at the call of the committee, until finally is launched the drastic movement of non-payment of taxes which will mark the climax of the revolt. All this constitutes a crisis of terrific consequence. The British Empire is quivering like a great ship struck by a tidal wave. English newspapers, the *Daily Herald* along with the *Times*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Evening*

Post, are deliberately, even desperately, striving to minimize the seriousness of what is taking place. But they are having poor success. An hour strikes in matters of this kind, and it has struck in India.

What will J. Ramsay MacDonald do with the Indian situation? This question may be answered clearly before this editorial appears. It should be answered, at least by a man like MacDonald, in the light of England's experience with earlier situations of exactly the same sort. Here the Premier has already in his mind that hindsight which is always so much better than foresight. Let him look back a century and a half to Lord North and the American colonies. Did truculence, force, a long and bitter war, accomplish anything? Would not the colonies have been saved to the Empire if the colonists had been treated as free men entitled to their own government of their own land? Or let MacDonald glance across the channel to Ireland. What did all the cruel centuries of blood and tears accomplish in that unhappy country? At enormous price to herself, as well as to the Irish, England postponed, but did not, as she could not, prevent the coming of the day when Ireland should be free. Had Westminster granted home rule even as late as the time of Gladstone, the Irish people would now be held in much closer fealty to the English Crown than they are today. But Britain would not have it so, and thus, after years of bloodshed and horror, Ireland enjoys a larger degree of freedom than Parnell ever demanded or Gladstone ever dreamed. So with India! This land is sooner or later going to be free, either inside or outside the British Empire. As well try to stop the progress of a star in its orbit as the progress of this eastern land toward liberty. The only question that remains is whether Indian freedom is coming amid conditions of torment, torture and terror, or amid conditions of cooperation and great goodwill. More than any other man alive in England MacDonald has it in his power to settle this question in accordance at once with his own high principles of Socialism and the righteous demands of the Indian people. Why does not the British Premier try again a great and dramatic gesture? Why does he not go to India and meet Gandhi, as he came to America and met Hoover? These two men could end dissension and find the way to peace. Is MacDonald big enough to meet the challenge?

At last! Boston is out for liberty. Yeah, the old town is stirred from the Common to the Back Bay over the outrages committed by a tyrannical government against the freedom of the individual citizen. After banning plays without number from its theatres, after suppressing books and magazines with an arrogance worthy of a Russian tsar, after closing halls and assembly places, even the spaces of the open air, to advocates of birth-control, pacifism, and justice for Sacco and Vanzetta, Boston has suddenly come to herself again. A few weeks ago the old "Cradle of Liberty," Faneuil Hall, was rocked as it has not been rocked since the days of the American Revolution. On the same occasion a mob of liberty lovers demonstrated on the Common as no mob has demonstrated since the days of the Boston massacre. The shades of Adams and Otis are astir again. The citizens of Boston, after long and shameful bondage to civic tyrants and religious bigots, are shaking off their chains and reviving the great days of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. What a thrilling and heartening spectacle! The ancient city in wild revolt against—*the shooting of the three rum smugglers by the U. S. Coast Guard off Newport!* Yes, this is the liberty that Boston cares about. Not the liberty of speech, or of press, or of public assembly —the basic rights of every free democracy! These still may be violated in the Hub with utter impunity. But the liberty that cannot be violated without a vast Faneuil Hall meeting of protest and a wild mob display on Boston Common, is the liberty to smuggle liquor into the country in contravention of the Constitution and laws of the United States. Boston believes in the inalienable right of the bootlegger to pursue his illicit and disgusting trade. She will next proclaim, we have no doubt, the inalienable right of the bandit to hold up travelers and rob banks. Hurrah for Boston! Free speech is still denied within her precincts and public meetings broken up, but criminals are not to be interfered with by the law.

Hurrah for Boston!

This shooting of rum-runners, however, has a significance that runs far beyond the bounds of Boston. Indignation over this so-called "murder in cold blood," as it has been called, has been rife all through the "wet" eastern portion of the country. Communities that have heard with utter equanimity of the shooting of unarmed Haitians by U. S. Marines, and have turned not a hair at the assassinations of helpless workers in North Carolina and Georgia, have raved in madness over this killing of a gang of liquor smugglers. We have no particular sympathy with shootings of this sort—we see nothing but futility in any attempt to enforce the law by processes of assassination. But in a world where fatal violence of this kind is almost as common as eating and sleeping, why should we get so excited over the deaths of bootleggers? Consider this parallelism, for example! A few weeks ago, three racketeers in Chicago were deliberately enticed into a trap by a contingent of police. The trap was well laid, and the racketeers walked in. The moment they appeared, the police leaped upon them, and without giving them the slightest chance to defend themselves,

or even to run away, shot them down one after another. No cornered rats were ever more callously slain than these Chicago criminals. But nobody got indignant, no protests or denunciations were voiced; on the contrary, so far as we could make out, everybody was glad that these three wanton violators of the law were dead. Yet, when three men of exactly the same type, engaged in landing contraband liquor, were killed in a running fight with the U. S. Coast Guard, who themselves were at every moment in peril of their lives, a cry was lifted to high heaven, as though some martyrs had been sacrificed upon an altar! What is there so sacred or so heroic about a bootlegger? Why have the American people no moral sentiment for anything but rum-running? These three men, killed by the Coast Guard while engaged in their illicit traffic, were criminals. We see no reason why they should be treated with any especial favor.

The *Christian Century* asks editorially, "Is the Episcopal Church a Christian Church?" The answer is easy. It is *not!* There are Christians in the Episcopal Church. We know and admire many of them—pre-eminently men like Howard Melish, of Brooklyn, Russell Bowie, of New York, Bishop Parsons, of San Francisco, and the saintly Paul Jones, to name only a few. But as long as the Episcopal Church guards as a body its pretentious and exclusive ecclesiastical claims, so that it cannot unite in Christian fellowship with other religious bodies, and as long as it honors and trusts and follows such a medieval inquisitor as the Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D. D., Bishop of New York, it is not a Christian church. The honored and honest William E. Barton speaks the truth in characteristically forthright fashion when he says, *à propos* of Manning and his cathedral in New York,

> As for those who solicit funds from men of all denominations to build an house of prayer, for all nations, and then do what those do who do such things, the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity.

But if the truth must be told about the Episcopal Church, why not about other churches as well? "Is the Episcopal Church a Christian Church?" Is *any* church a Christian church? On the specific issue of church unity, about which the Editor of the *Christian Century* was speaking, we can think of a good many churches which are officially more Christian than the Episcopal Church. But there are other issues—war and peace, for example, the rights of labor, racial equality and brotherhood, free speech, birth control—and on such issues what church really "comes clean"? The fact of the matter is, we have little Christianity anywhere, either inside the churches or outside. If we had, there perhaps wouldn't be any churches. Certainly there wouldn't be any civilization as we know it today. We think of the famous saying of James Russell Lowell,

> There is dynamite enough in the New Testament . . . to blow all our existing institutions to atoms.

"Patriotism Is Not Enough"

Patriotism as the approval of war is bankrupt! It has lost its constitutional standing; and any contention for it as a method of settling international disputes is against the Constitution of the United States. Any individual, therefore, who advocates military preparation and military methods nullifies the Constitution.

Article 6, paragraph 2 of our Constitution reads: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding."

"All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land." Be it noted that the Briand-Kellogg treaty which outlaws war is now a law of the land. This treaty states that, "The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the name of their respective peoples, that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in the relations with one another. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement of solutions of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

For the first time a teacher in our public schools may legally and lawfully put on the walls of her classroom the words, "The United States renounces war as an instrument of national policy, and he that urges military methods violates the law of the land." It also gives every editor, writer and lecturer the constitutional right to condemn the advocates of militarism.

This is the first time in the history of mankind that the militarist has been put on the defensive. He who lauds force as an instrument of national policy can no longer drape the folds of the American flag about him and declare he is the only 110 per cent American. He is now forced to apologize for his contentions; for he is engaged in defeating the very law of the land.

The making of the Briand-Kellogg treaty a law of our land, has given sincere peace advocates a

status which they have not had heretofore, and places those who cannot become reconciled to war within the category of the true patriot. It has given the word pacifist its rightful place, legalizing it, and making it synonymous with good law-abiding citizenship. From henceforth pacifism and Americanism are one and the same.

If all this contention be unpatriotic, or treason, then President Hoover is a traitor, for he has insisted that the Briand-Kellogg treaty must be honored by this country as a solemn obligation, even as every other treaty. Moreover, all the deliberations of the forthcoming arms conference in London are to use this treaty as the point of departure and basis of authority.

It has been the habit to denounce the contender for peace as being yellow, mercenary, and willing to sell out his country to an enemy at any price, thus bringing suffering and bloodshed without any armed protection. Yet no one in his right mind can read the senate's investigation of the Shearer scandal involving the munitions manufacturers, without realizing that these professional patrioteers—the advocates of larger armies and navies—were willing to sell out the young men of America for the profit they would make out of their blood.

How they can ever lift their heads again without burning shame for this dastardly betrayal in their bloody greed to sell the bodies of American youth is more than any sane mind can fathom. Yet they are the men who have dared to call peace advocates "yellow-bellied traitors." These are the simon-pure patriots who had the temerity to draw up black lists of those who, unlike themselves, were unwilling to aid in the wholesale slaughter of their friends' sons. May God have mercy on such Judas Iscariots!

The method of settling international disputes by arbitration and adjudication has at length captured the imagination of the world. Men and women are beginning to realize that war as a method is subject to human control; that it is a social institution, and can be changed or done away with by the will and effort of man, even as he is changing all his other institutions. War is therefore no more inevitable, or inherent in the nature of things than dueling or owning chattel slaves.

Exploded also are the fallacies of war's benignity. It was once argued, though not proven, that war protects the weak, insures safety and vindicates principles. What a grim jest! Think of a war fought to protect human lives, the sick, the crippled, the infirm, and which destroys 10,000,000 of the earth's finest flower of manhood, outrages and cripples 15,000,000 and orphans 5,000,000 children!

Think of a war fought to insure safety and produce tranquility, and then blast to infinitesimal bits the homes, farms, factories, churches, schools of whole nations. Think of a war fought to vindicate principle, and then deliberately outrage every principle of democracy, free speech and assembly, free thought and free press, the sacredness of personality and sacredness of private property, until eleven years after our jails are still filled with men and women whose only crime was that of believing the Constitution and taking it seriously.

War has become the most certain method for destroying civilization. If we should stand at a certain street corner and cause all the men that were murdered in the last war to pass by in a parade of the dead with twenty abreast, it would require ninety-eight days or three months and eight days for the procession to move past us. Can any one reconcile that picture with the contention of Christianity that human life is sacred?

One week of the World war cost the United States a sum of dollars sufficient to build in every state of the union a total of 960 high schools each costing $100,000; 1,540 grade schools costing $40,000 each; 480 churches costing $100,000 each; 1,920 recreation centers with playground and swimming pool costing $35,000 each. An automobile and tractor could be bought for every one of the 6,500,000 farms in our country, and $600,000,000 left over for good roads, with what the United States spent in a half year during the last war. Two universities like Columbia, the largest university in the world, could be established for the price of one battleship which becomes obsolete in fifteen years. And yet we are told we fought the war to protect life, property and to insure wealth. Such reasoning is too severe a strain on the human mind.

We have at length come to realize that the institution of war, even as any other institution, can exist only by sufferance of the common people; and if they deliver an ultimatum through the medium of public opinion to their officials that they will substitute law for the sword, the judge for the cannon, then nothing can stop that most holy onrush of the public will. The people of this nation are behind President Hoover in his attempts throughout the world with Ramsay MacDonald of England to make war illegal in the world, and to establish such judicial means as will adjudicate disputes and settle differences.

President Hoover has united against him those who would profit in money, or honor, or special favor from the blood spilt during war. It therefore, behooves all men and women who believe in Mr. Hoover's sincerity of purpose to put forth every effort to create a public opinion that will sustain him in this revolutionary work for world peace, which shall cause him to go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen of all time.

"Would you end war? Create great peace!"

W. Waldemar W. Argon.

Jottings

The White House caught fire just before Christmas. The Capitol caught fire just after New Year's. Are these signs and portents of disaster? Are the gods sending down warnings of impending doom upon the Hoover administration? How unfortunate that we have no augurs, as they did in ancient Rome, to tell us what these things mean! But perhaps the Fundamentalists will tell us.

In the *Nation's* Honor Roll for 1929, Mr. S. O. Levinson is named as "father of the idea of the Outlawry of War, now embodied in the Paris Peace Pact and formally accepted by the great Powers of the world."

It is reported by the New York police that murders are now done on a regular contract basis. The business efficiency of the American people is indeed incomparable.

Following a recent disastrous fire in New York, a quick inspection of the neighborhood was made and fifty violators of fire laws were fined in one court in a single day. Could so many violators of the Prohibition laws be found in the same area in the same space of time? Whether or no, it is ridiculous to imagine that there is anything exceptional or extraordinary in the violation of the Prohibition laws. Americans violate *all* laws that inconvenience them, Prohibition laws simply among the rest.

News comes from Paris that the French government is proposing to put a tariff tax of 90 per cent on all imported automobiles. Such a tax, it is said, will wipe out the American market. This sounds good! American manufacturers can now enjoy a little taste of their own protective tariff medicine.

Mr. Wickersham's crime commission is evidently planning a long-continued study of its problem. Yet the problem of crime is simple. Take one criminal, add two policemen, and to these add three politicians, and you have all the elements involved.

J. H. H.

Why Moscow Was Indignant

When Maxim Litvinoff, the Soviet Government's acting Commissar for Foreign Affairs, expressed resentment over the recent American peace note to China and Russia, officials in Washington expressed astonishment. They asked how the action of the American Secretary of State, in reminding the two nations of their commitments under the Pact for the Renunciation of War, could possibly be considered an unfriendly act.

The dispatch did not indicate whether the astonishment of the Washington officials in question was registered with or without the fingers crossed. It is a fair guess that the amazement was scarcely disingenueous, unless it could be, as Litvinoff suggests, that our officialdom learns of Sino-Russian matters chiefly from the Chinese Minister in Washington.

Russian indignation over the fact that American intervention should occur not when Russian legal rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway were being violated but rather at the moment when Mukden seemed on the point of accepting the Soviet minimum demands for a return to the status quo ante on the railroad should not be difficult to understand. With Nanking at the time still urging Mukden to maintain an uncompromising resistance to the Soviet Government's conditions and with any interference by the Powers likely to destroy the progress toward peace already painfully achieved it is no cause for wonder that Litvinoff lashed out sharply. To interpret Russian resentment over the reminder of the Kellogg Pact's implications as indicating a desire for war, as part of the American press has been doing, is wide of the mark.

Sympathetic as one may be with China's hope of throwing off the yoke of foreign aggression which over a period of ninety years has chafed the Chinese people to an extent unparalleled in the history of nations an attempt to view recent happenings in Northern Manchuria objectively suggests that injustice there has not been all on one side. Without reasonable doubt the Chinese Eastern Railway has been employed by the Russians to further communist doctrines and policies. Nor can it well be denied that the Soviet Government has resisted Chinese attempts to win the parity in management which the 1924 agreements stipulated. On the other hand, Russia has found herself on the defensive against the nation-wide Chinese drive to end foreign infringements upon Chinese national sovereignty. The effects of this campaign began to make themselves felt in Northern Manchuria early in 1925, although in 1925 and 1926 it was the British who bore the brunt of it, with the Japanese receiving chief attention in 1927 and 1928. In 1929 Russia, after having had several tastes of what was to come, found herself the focus of the Chinese attack.

Early in 1925 the "China for the Chinese" movement was not yet showing much activity on the Northern Manchuria front. It proceeded cautiously and for the most part by diplomatic means, although in May when M. Ivanoff, General Manager of the Chinese Eastern Railway, sought to dismiss a considerable number of "White" Russian employees the dispatch of Chinese troops to Harbin influenced him to change his mind. So long as Chang Tso-lin was chiefly busied with his military activities south of the Great Wall, little open hostility to the Soviet Government was manifest. But with his return to Mukden the vigor of his attack upon Soviet interests grew somewhat in proportion with the regaining of his military power.

During the winter the so-called Ivanoff incident

occurred. On January 16, 1926, Manager Ivanoff refused to permit the transportation on credit of 3,000 Chinese soldiers, and suspended traffic on the Harbin-Changchun branch following disturbances on the part of these troops. As a consequence Ivanoff and three Russian directors of the Chinese Eastern were arrested on January 21st by troops under Chang's orders, and held for several days.

During 1925 a Chinese attempt was made to take over full administration of the Harbin municipality. The consular representatives of several of the Powers protested so vehemently that the action was not consummated until 1926, when General Chang Huan-hsiang, under orders of Chang Tso-lin, arbitrarily dissolved the Russian administrative body. Despite foreign consular opposition a new municipal council composed exclusively of Chinese was organized on November 1, 1926.

A river fleet of 11 steamers and 30 barges which had been operated on the Sungari and Amur rivers under the management of the railroad, with all wharfs and warehouses attached, was commandeered on August 31, 1926, under the orders of Chang Tso-lin. The total tonnage of the ships taken over was about 20,000 tons and their value was estimated to be $14,000,000 Mex. A Russian protest was forthcoming but Chang justified the seizure on the grounds that operation of the fleet was contrary to the 1924 agreements and because the Soviet authorities were charged with the confiscation of 11 Chinese barges at Vladivostok.

It was in 1926 also that the educational program which had been under the direction of the railroad was taken over by the Chinese. The Russian as well as the Chinese schools which had been operated in Harbin and elsewhere along the railway zone from Manchouli to Pogranichnaya and Changchun were appropriated by Chang Tso-lin on the grounds that they were being used for propagating communist doctrine. The Russo-Chinese Technical School, the Russian Museum and the Russian Library, all in Harbin, were included in the seizure.

In 1927 the Chinese won their demand that half the funds of the railway should be deposited in Chinese banks and no longer exclusively in Russian institutions. Also the quarterly division between China and Russia of the road's profits was begun.

In 1928 the telephone system in Harbin which had been operated by the railroad was seized by the Chinese authorities. It was valued at about $3,000,000 Mex. Later the telegraph system in Harbin was also taken possession of. Many complaints were made by Russian passengers and Russian employes of discriminatory, sometimes brutal, treatment by the Chinese police in the railway zone.

A well-known Japanese correspondent states that shortly before the May 27th raid upon the Harbin Consulate the Chinese authorities had been making further serious demands upon the Russians. The Russian head of the railroad's Commercial Department who did all the purchasing was to be replaced by a Chinese. The telephone and telegraph system in its entirety should be detached from the Railroad and administered by the Chinese. The Russian head of the Accounting Department should be replaced by a Chinese. The remainder of the lands heretofore administered by the Railway but not absolutely essential to its maintenance should be returned to China. All mines and forests owned by the Railroad should be likewise surrendered. According to the same writer it was the seriousness of these demands which led Consul-General Melnikov to call the conference of Soviet leaders which was raided on May 27th. All these Chinese encroachments upon the Russian position, justified as they may have been, prompted neutral observers to predict that sooner or later the Railroad itself would be taken. At the time of the May 27th raid Japanese news agencies in Manchuria suggested that it was merely a preliminary move looking toward a later seizure of the Chinese Eastern. It is appropriate to remark, however, at this point that in the present dispute Japanese opinion has rather consistently been unsympathetic toward the Chinese. The forcible taking over of foreign interests in Manchuria by China does not especially appeal to the Japanese mind.

Shortly after the Railroad's seizure, not a seizure but merely a temporary self-defense move according to Mr. C. C. Wu, Chinese Minister to Washington, both Russians and Chinese expressed an earnest desire to seek a peaceful solution of the difficulty. The delay in starting the necessary negotiations has been chiefly caused by Chinese unwillingness to first restore the status quo on the Railroad as the Soviet Government has consistently demanded.

Exigencies of Chinese politics have complicated the situation. Several different Chinese political or military groups have apparently proven themselves somewhat at cross purposes in the matter. The most important of these different groups have been those comprising the Chiang Kai-shek government at Nanking and those of the Chang Hsueh-liang party at Mukden. Although Chang Hsueh-liang has appeared desirous of leaving the solution of Manchuria's foreign affairs to Nanking it has been quite apparent that the Nanking attitude toward the Soviet Government has been consistently less conciliatory than that of the Manchurian authorities. Nanking, of course, has had less to lose and possibly more to gain by a continuance of strained Sino-Russian relations in Manchuria. The uncompromising position of Nanking, therefore, has hampered the Soviet Government in its attempts to establish grounds for peaceful solution of the problem. It was reported in the Japanese press that the conversations at Manchouli in July between Russian and Chinese representatives failed chiefly because of disagreements between Chu Shao-yang, Nanking's envoy, and Tsai Yun-shung of Mukden. Apparently the Nanking official went so far as to order Tsai's arrest for exceeding his authority in the zeal to compromise with the Russians.

The Russian desire to negotiate has been stimulated by the economic loss which the suspension of railway communication on July 17th between Russia and Manchuria has meant to her. According to a dispatch in the London Times of November 6th the receipts on the Chinese Eastern, even after losing the transcontinental traffic, are higher than ever. If this is true it is due to the fact that traffic which was formerly divided between the ports of Dairen and Vladivostok is now all going to the south. With the competition between the two routes ended full rates are now being paid instead of the preferential rates which were paid hitherto. The net result of the change to Russia is that her port of Vladivostok lies comparatively idle as Dairen rapidly relegates it to a place of comparative insignificance.

The excuse for putting military pressure upon the

Chinese without declaration of war has been afforded the Soviet Government by the presence of bands of "White" Guardists, who, according to numerous observers, have been carrying on guerilla warfare against their Red enemies. The display of Soviet military strength as witnessed in the forays which have been made across the frontier into Chinese territory has undoubtedly served as a factor in bringing Mukden to the terms which Russia feared Stimson endangered by taking a hand in the matter.

Litvinoff's criticism of the move of our State Department is not due then to any lack of sympathy with the aims of the Kellogg Pact. Possibly no great nation has better proved its desire for peace than Russia, as it has swallowed numerous provocations from China, provocations which have even included the execution of Soviet Government officials. Moscow's indignation was prompted by the mistaken idea that Secretary Stimson was seeking to upset a precarious footing, laboriously reached, on the road to Sino-Russian peace. Litvinoff's blast was no cause for astonishment. More astonishing by far is the American mentality which can pillory Moscow for its unfriendly reception of the American peace reminder and within the same week display no concern over the shooting of Haitians by American marines. HENRY L. KINGMAN.

Gandhi, Nehru, and Revolting India

I am just completing three memorable days with Mahatma Gandhi. The way had been paved for me by letters from C. F. Andrews. The result was that we were quickly taken into the family circle at the Ashram. We had three long interviews with Mahatmaji, in addition to many fleeting contacts with him during our stay, in spite of the fact that he had been away on tour for three months and was to leave again within a week.

We arrived at the Ashram on Monday, which is Gandhi's day of silence. Beginning at seven o'clock every Sunday evening he observes absolute silence for twenty-four hours. This period is spent in rest, meditation, and writing his weekly contributions for *Young India*. Two of his friends met us at the Ahmedabad railway station and drove us four miles to our destination. Gandhi received us with a most hospitable smile, but was unable to converse with us until later. We spent the day talking with members of the colony or community and in observing the various activities being conducted. At seven we attended corporate worship. The entire company sits in the sand overlooking the river, under the open sky. Following the chanting of the evening prayers, Mahatmaji broke his silence and talked on a devotional theme. Then followed the daily business meeting. As the roll was called each person reported the quantity of his or her spinning for the day. This was followed by a half hour's discussion of a proposed new daily schedule of meals and other activities. We could not understand what was being said, but were intensely interested in watching the proceedings. With the utmost good humor and patience Gandhi brought out the various points of view, until some forty persons had taken part in the discussion. No vote was taken but a unanimous agreement was reached.

Mr. Gandhi then invited us to his own quarters. He seated himself on his bed in the open garden where he sleeps, while we occupied a nearby bench, and there we talked for nearly an hour. Standing about the bed and the bench were a score of his co-workers, listening eagerly to the conversation. It was a picture we shall not soon forget. On the following afternoon we were invited to his office. In accordance with the Indian custom, we removed our shoes at the door and sat on the floor. He was working away at his spinning wheel. For an hour and a half we talked politics. He expressed himself with the utmost frankness concerning the present situation. The spinning seemed to be an almost automatic performance and did not in the least interfere with the conversation. On his busiest days and even when on tour he always spins for at least an hour. On the following afternoon we again talked for more than an hour while he went on spinning.

The four of us felt that we were in the presence of one of the noblest spirits of the age, if not indeed the greatest man now alive. He has a frail little body and weighs less than a hundred pounds. He wears a minimum of clothes, usually goes stripped to the waist, with his feet bare except for sandals when outdoors. His ears are large, his teeth are in wretched shape, his head is shaved, and yet you do not think of him as homely. He eats only fruit and nuts and drinks goat's milk. Arising at three or four o'clock every morning, he is an indefatigable worker. Rarely alone, he does much of his work with a crowd about him. Methodical in his habits, he is as punctual as a clock. His mind cuts like a razor. He expresses himself with brevity and clarity in the purest of English. Body and mind are subjected to an extraordinarily rigorous discipline, yet there is no trace of austerity about him. On the contrary, he is the most jovial of persons. Following the evening meal he usually takes the children for a walk. Ascetic in spirit, entirely selfless in his conduct, sacrificial in his devotion to the masses, Mahatmaji has captured the imagination and won the devotion of more millions of human beings than any other person for many generations.

At Allahabad we were entertained by Jawaharlal Nehru, President of the Indian National Congress, the annual gathering of the largest and most important political party, ex-President of the All-India Trade Union Congress, and leader of the Youth League of India. His father, Motilal Nehru, who was President of the Congress last year, was away on tour. The Nehru family is very wealthy and lives in a palatial mansion. Father and son disagree drastically in many of their opinions on social questions. Jawaharlal is more radical in his political and economic ideas. He is a Socialist, not a Communist, as is often asserted. A graduate of Harrow and Cambridge, he is brilliantly prepared for leadership. He is seeking to organize students and workers for more efficient activity in the campaign for independence from Great Britain, on the one hand, and from the landlords and industrialists on the other. Favored with a magnetic and lovable personality, Jawaharlal kindles audiences and crowds wherever he goes and is the idol of Indian youth. So

passionate is his revolt against the reactionary customs and cruel practices of conventional religion that he calls himself an agnostic, although it would be difficult to discover many men in any country who possess his untiring zeal for the public welfare. From the tinge of sadness in his countenance, it is apparent that he is suffering intensely over the miseries of his people. That he is honest and sincere is admitted even by his most vigorous opponents. Next to Gandhi, or perhaps even more so, he is the man most feared by the British Government. The name of Jawaharlal Nehru will appear prominently in the news from India during the coming months. His star is rising rapidly and soon may be shining most brilliantly of all.

From the Nehru home we went direct to the Viceregal Lodge in Delhi, where we were entertained at luncheon by Lord and Lady Irwin. We were deeply impressed with the personality and attitude of the Viceroy. Everywhere he is held in high honor and is trusted as few Viceroys have ever been. After luncheon he invited us to his private office and there unfolded to us some of the difficulties with which he is confronted and discussed some of the plans he has in mind. I have no doubt whatever that the Viceroy and the Labor Government intend to do the wise and generous thing for India. They are, however, faced with two sets of obstacles: they lack a working majority in Parliament and are therefore compelled to move cautiously in order to carry a portion of the Liberals and Tories with them; and, secondly, they must deal with an impatient and embittered public opinion in India.

The tragic truth is that a considerable proportion of educated Indians have lost confidence in the British people. Suspicion and enmity are distressingly prevalent, and old residents here say that the tide is still rising at a perilous pace. The ancient tradition of British fair play is rapidly being shattered. British promises are no longer accepted at face value. Even those Englishmen who have served India most faithfully and sacrificially are often objects of abuse and derision. C. F. Andrews is probably more highly honored and more deeply beloved than any foreigner in this land, yet two Indian journals recently launched vicious attacks upon him, one count in their indictment being the fact that he had dined with the British Ambassador in Washington! Reminders of the incalculable contribution that Britain has made to India's welfare are impatiently brushed aside or met with sneering references to British hypocrisy and greed. Gratitude toward alien rulers has never in all history been an outstanding characteristic of subject peoples who are passionately seeking freedom. Not until responsible self-government has been actually achieved will most Indian nationalists be in a mood to trust the British or to acknowledge India's debt to them. . . . Mr. Gandhi and other Indian leaders with whom we have talked freely admit that under self-government there will undoubtedly be a much greater degree of inefficiency and corruption. They foresee a period of chaos and possible bloodshed. But they are prepared to face the worst conditions that can be predicted rather than to prolong the present status which they regard as humiliating, demoralizing and intolerable. They, therefore, dismiss as irrelevant the question as to whether or not India is fit for self-government. They say that, if necessary, they would prefer to go to hell as citizens of a free nation than to dwell in paradise under British rule. To be "eaten up by the hordes from the Northwest and Central Asia," says Mahatma Gandhi, would be a "position infinitely superior to one of ever-growing emasculation . . . a sudden overwhelming swoop from Central Asia . . . would be humane deliverance from the living and ignominious death which we are going through at the present moment." So intense is the longing for freedom and so bitter is the hatred of alien domination that British rule in India is certain to become less and less efficient. It can be prolonged beyond another decade only by the bloody sword. Nothing is more certain than that India will achieve self-government within the immediate future or—one hesitates to contemplate the outcome.

It is easy to sneer at the Indian National Congress, as is the fashion in Anglo-Saxon circles out here, and say that it represents a mere handful of India's three hundred millions and that the masses are utterly indifferent to politics. It is beside the point to say that the revolt against British rule is confined to an infinitesimal minority. When in human history did the populace at large ever support a revolutionary movement until it had already achieved success? Slavery and serfdom were not abolished by collective action on the part of slaves and serfs. The group of Indians who are determined to win freedom for their nation is already sufficiently large and vocal to make life simply intolerable for British rulers if responsible self-government is not granted at an early date.

India obviously cannot gain freedom by war. But other methods are available. The non-violent non-cooperation movement led by Gandhi in 1920 and 1921 came very nearly succeeding, as British officials have since admitted. In desperation the Mahatma may again summon his people to a program of non-cooperation. More than 30,000 Indians gladly went to prison during the former campaign and an even greater number may again crowd the jails of the land. A more terrifying prospect is that the policy of non-violence may be rejected and a campaign of rioting and assassination resorted to. Already there have been an ominous number of political murders and riots. Some of the strongest trade unions are under the sway of leaders who openly advocate the adoption of revolutionary tactics. If another General Dyer, under the sway of the military mindset that law and order must be maintained at any cost, should again shoot down in cold blood hundreds of Indians as was done at Amritsar, the situation might easily get out of hand all over the country and the terrible scenes of the Mutiny be repeated. After all, there are only 165,000 Britishers in the whole of India. An inflamed and infuriated nation of 320 millions cannot permanently be ruled by British bayonets. Moreover, there is an alarming possibility that the Communists may deliberately resort to provocative measures in order to incite British officials to adopt a drastic policy of repression. The number of Communists in the entire country is probably very small, but only a handful of incendiaries is needed to kindle a huge conflagration when so much inflammable material is scattered about.

There are drastic differences of opinion as to how

serious would be the results if the Lahore Congress should decide to begin non-cooperation and civil disobedience.* One group maintains that nothing significant would happen, that at most there would be occasional riots which would easily be put down, that the few non-cooperators who refused to pay taxes would only lose their property and find themselves in jail, and that the vast majority of Indians would entirely ignore the non-cooperation movement. The other group contends that the country is better prepared for non-cooperation now than it was in 1920 and 1921, that the volume of bitterness and hatred against Britain has increased enormously, and that repressive measures on the part of the Government would only fan the flames. Mr. Gandhi is to be found in the latter camp. He told his co-workers recently that the anticipated campaign early next year would be his last great crusade and that he expected to put every ounce of his energy into it. The National Congress, the organized workers, the students—and Mahatmaji: this is a combination of opponents that I would not care to have arrayed against me if I were Viceroy of India! To grant complete Dominion Status at this time would undoubtedly be a dangerous procedure; to withhold it may prove to be far more perilous.

KIRBY PAGE.

Mahatma Gandhi's Ashram,
Sabarmati, India.

*This the Lahore Congress has decided to do.—EDITOR.

Francis Bacon and His "New Atlantis"

(*A commentary on the first* 300 *years of its publication*)
1629-1929

In the year of our Lord, 1629, exactly three hundred years ago and just three years after its author's death, an unfinished work appeared in print, being an earnest Utopia from the pen of the great English essayist, Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans (1561-1626.) In that book the great Englishman sought to perfect human society in the light of his bold, scientific aspirations, yet trusting in a benevolent God and "imploring His aid and blessing for the illumination of our labors—turning them into good and holy uses," as the author himself puts it in the daily prayer of the citizens of his commonwealth.

From the tower of our own unbelieving and scientific age, the most remarkable feature of the scheme is its author's obvious confidence that there must be no conflict between religion and science; in fact, the official seal of the scientifically-minded Utopians is "a stamp of cherubim's wings . . . and by them a cross." Religious strife and intolerance, the rise of narrow-minded nationalism and the general political history of the three centuries just past, make us speculate as to Bacon's reactions, were he to re-enter now the arena. Nearly all of his daring dream in the fields of experimental science became a matter of daily routine, with achievements much greater than the dreamer ever conspired.

The citizens of the island of Bensalem (with a lawgiver "wholly bent to make his kingdom and people happy," and a heart "inscrutable for good") built their life upon the scientific findings of Saloman's House, which was "the lantern" of the kingdom. Investigation, experimentation and adherence to scientific truths created the social order dearest to the thinker's mind. But to Bacon scientific progress finds its best only when eternally wedded to "the name of Jesus, and His merits;" his formula is that creative science, plus dynamic religon equals a rationally happy humanity. A characteristic illustration of the working of such a philosophy is found in the behavior of the king of the island, "a wise man and a great warrior," who, in one of his military campaigns "compelled (the enemies) to render themselves without striking a stroke; and after they were at his mercy, contenting himself only with their oath, that they should no more bear arms against him, dismissed them all in safety." The islanders, of course, had intercourse and traded with other nations, but "not for gold, silver, or jewels, nor for silks, nor for spices, nor any other commodity of matter; but only for God's first creature, which was light; to have light of the growth of all parts of the world." Happy are the people of Bensalem—the people of Bacon's dream, who learned to master themselves and make science their true benefactor!

How different the acclamation of our own generations who manage to materialize the aspirations of the laboratory yet fail so miserably in attaining their happiness! Our people (some of them) may occupy modern apartments; they (some of them) may have the latest model of automobile and radio, and even a desirable savings account. But are they secure and happy? The happy people of Bensalem have it as their favorite saying, "whosover is unchaste cannot reverence himself; and . . . the reverence of a man's self is, next (to) religion, the chiefest bridel of all vices." What self-respect has *our* generation that, in a brief period of four years, three months and eleven days, could enthusiastically and prayerfully kill 9,998,771 of living mothers' sons of twenty-seven mostly Christian nations; seriously maim some 6,295,512 more; with 14,002,039 more otherwise crippled—all this at an unbelievable cost of nearly 338 *billion* dollars! And we not only fail to repent this colossal crime, but actually, in secret, plot to excel this very annihilation of human life and self-respect in some near future, with the aid of our endowed Houses of Saloman and their willing laboratories?

In the three hundred years that have elapsed since the publication of Bacon's "New Atlantis," man has materialized his scientific vision, but this at the apparent expense of spiritual and moral bankruptcy. In our age of reason and mass-production, science is prostituted and made to undermine the very structure of organized and civilized society. "In his ideal world of the New Atlantis, science is made the civilizer who binds man to man, and is his leader to the love of God."

May we learn to repent and amend, lest we forget.

DAVID GITTLEMAN.

Romain Rolland

Great Soul of France

"Clerambault" was the first volume that met my eye as I entered that cozy Chinese room and glanced with fascination on the packed book-shelves that encircled the library. Unconsciously I took down the book when Professor Kuo seated me by the steaming porcelain stove; I was attracted by the musical title, and since we had met to discuss literature, I thought we could, perhaps, begin as well with one as another.

So my introduction to Romain Rolland came in 1924 in a Chinese poet's study. I read "Clerambault" that night, and was so stirred by the story of this valiant French spirit that I started the ten volumes of "Jean Christophe" a week later. It was my good fortune to accumulate in quick order the three classic biographies, "Beethoven," "Tolstoy," and "Gandhi," the short novels, and, with its publication, the new three-volume story of a woman, called "The Soul Enchanted."

Monsieur Rolland is worthy of acquaintance because he carries with his artistry an impressive morality. The divine music which he records is to be "a light which will illumine life." He speaks for himself as well as Christophe when he says, "He wished his music to be an act of communion with other men. There is no vital art save that which is linked with the rest of humanity."

This contemporary of France is a prophet of faith. The reader need but take up "Beethoven," which celebrates the "foremost musician and the most heroic force of modern art." Its publication in 1903 was, in Péguy's words, "not only the beginning of Rolland's literary success and of that of the *Cahiers de la quinzaine,* but infinitely more than a beginning of literary fortune, it was a sudden moral revelation, an unveiled, revealed presentiment, the revelation, the flowering, the sudden communication of a great moral fortune."

His heroes—Beethoven, Michelangelo, Tolstoy, Gandhi—are heroic men who want the truth. He is ever addressing men in the heritage of his heroes to go out valiantly into life. "Faith is a heroic force"—the enthusiasm that made all his galaxy of active characters. "A man who does not feel within himself this intoxication of strength, this jubilation in living—even in the depths of experience, is not an artist. That is the touchstone. True greatness is shown in this power of rejoicing."

There is no figure in the prose of this century more contagiously spiritual than the musician, Jean Christophe. The unrelated splotches of his long life are knit together by the heroic soul of the man. "The great thing," he says, "is never to give up willing and living." "Hosanna to life. Hosanna to death" was the song the old musician sang as he left the world.

Like Browning, he is ever calling man to his divine creative task. "There is no joy but in creation. There are no living beings but those who create. All the rest are shadows, hovering over the earth, strangers to life." As he sees it, "life is a symphony; each moment of life sings in several parts;" and the hosannas will come as the crowning note to all who valiantly strive!

It is the spirit of these books that makes them spread about the earth through scores of translations and successive editions. In writing his first life-novel Rolland admitted that he had let it spread out like a river; and it appears to us as did the confused action of Paris to the mind of Annette, like a meandering stream. His long novels are disjointed, apparently hastily plotted, with far too many subordinates clinging about the main figure, but there is a directness and simplicity that makes the stories lifelike, and there is a ringing sincerity that makes the books carry.

"One thing," says his heroine Annette, "one thing I don't forgive, hypocrisy." Always Monsieur Rolland is straining to lift the curtains of darkness and raise the windows for light. Annette and her son Marc, like Christophe and Olivier and Professor Clerambault, were determined to see through the shams that kept men unhappy and nations in disharmony. Just as the young German musician took up, in his stage of developing genius, all his previous compositions and the work of his favorites, and brought them under the ruthless test of reality, so this author summons the musicians of Europe, the great leaders of men, and the events of history to meet his terrible sincerity.

The able critic, René Lalou, sums up his opinion of Rolland in the course of his exhaustive study, "Contemporary French Literature," as follows: "His virtues are absolute sincerity, hatred of every baseness and every hypocrisy, love of heroism and divine music."

This fine tribute leaves unsaid one of the fundamental attributes that make the man so beloved beyond the reaches of his homeland, and that is his broad humanism. In those departures from his more serious vein, "Colas Breugnon, Burgundian" and "Liluli," where he writes more of the mere joy of living, he tries to renew the laughter of Rabelais and Diderot, but his dominant purpose is for "heroic action" and "the passion for light." The protagonists of his most effective works are consecrated to strenuous humanitarian tasks.

The high purpose of his writing seems to be found in the words of Antigone, "I am made for love, and not for hate." Such a free spirit, who has a warm friendliness for men of India, China, and all groups of society, is exerting remarkable influence in building the new internationalism. "What have I to do with your nations? Can you expect me to love or hate a nation? It is men that I love or dislike, and in all nations you will find the noble, the base, and the ordinary man. . . . You talk of struggles and hatred between races? Races are the colors of life's prism; it binds them together, and we have light. Woe to him who shatters it! I am not of one race, I belong to life as a whole; I have brothers in every nation. The families of our souls are scattered through the world. Let us reunite them!"

Throughout the conflict of Europe he held to these high peace ideals, proclaiming in those phenomenal essays, "Above the Battle," written just after the Marne: "For the finer spirits of Europe there are two dwelling-places: our earthly fatherland, and that other City of God. Of the one we are the guests, of the other the builders. To the one let us give our lives and our faithful hearts; but neither family,

friend, nor fatherland, nor aught that we love has power over the spirit. The spirit is the light. It is our duty to lift it above tempests, and thrust aside the clouds which threaten to obscure it; to build higher and stronger, dominating the injustice and hatred of nations, the walls of that city wherein the souls of the whole world may assemble."

Thus he brings to a sweeping world-wide application his doctrine of confident living and creative goodwill. The theme of his last novel, "Mother and Son," is, "For peace is not the absence of war. It is the virtue that is born from the vigor of the soul."

Romain Rolland is reaping the reward of his warm-souled friendliness from conversations in Chinese libraries, and from the response of reading men in every section today. Surely he knows what Jean Christophe could not understand—"He did not know that a great soul is never alone, that, however Fortune may cheat him of friendship, in the end a great soul creates friends by the radiance of the love with which it is filled, and that even in that hour, when he thought himself forever isolated, he was more rich in love than the happiest men and women in the world."—*Robert Merrill Bartlett, Zion's Herald.*

The Study Table

Christianity Under Attack

The present volume* is the outcome of the discussion which was aroused a year ago by Professor Barnes's address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The spirit of the book is excellent. Good nature and urbanity go along with the most drastic criticism. The title suggests that it is a setting forth of the Götterdämmerung of the gods of Christianity. There may be said to be three main theses which the author develops. (1) That suggested by the title; (2) the Menace of Orthodox Religion to civilization; (3) Unitarian Humanism as the most promising form of religion now in sight. But underlying all of these the contention

that the old supernatural concepts and criteria relating to human conduct should be discredited and abolished as rapidly as possible and supplanted by strictly secular and mundane considerations!

The chapter which deals with the menace of orthodox religion is perhaps the most sweeping in its indictment of religion past and present.

Conventional religion is the chief single cause of cultural lag and the main influence in society producing a static and conservative outlook upon life.

The author develops this theme by showing in the fields of the intellectual life in general, in politics, in law, business, in sound sexology, in education, in journalism, and in art religion acts as a distinctly retarding influence. Two things your reviewer would say of this contention. First, that Professor Barnes has yielded to the besetting sin of most writers in giving an objective entity to religion. Religion consists in states of mind, acts of worship, organizations for work in churches, etc. It is various manifestations of the activity of the human animal in his relations with what he believes to be the supernatural powers. Your reviewer thinks the subject would be clarified if the author looked for certain deeper causes of human behavior. He might find that the same influences which make men conservative in religious beliefs make them also conservative lawyers or judges. It may be quite true, and probably is, that capitalism and Protestantism have grown up together, and that each has supplemented the other. It may be open to question, however, whether our author, following Tawney, is right in maintaining that capitalism is the child of Protestantism. May it not rather be the fact that both grew from a common parentage, namely, the social and economic conditions which were present in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. So perhaps of politics, of journalism and some of the other institutions which Mr. Barnes mentions. It must be admitted, of course, that religious practices and beliefs become stereotyped, they become crystallized into institutions, and thus become in themselves a part of the *milieu* of other institutions and practises. But then the same is true of law, medicine, politics, journalism and business. All of them follow the precedents of their own institutionalized life, and perhaps exert as strong an influence in keeping the churches conservative as the reverse. All of which may not vitiate the author's conclusion "that conventional religion is the chief single cause of cultural lag."

Professor Barnes warns against the criticism of his book as being in many aspects "old stuff." He maintains that the "faith of our fathers" is still rampant. Of course he is quite right. At the same time he would be ready to admit, I am sure, that for most readers of UNITY, for most Unitarians, much of what he has to say about the Bible, its canon, its higher criticism, the authenticity of the Apocrypha, etc., is tolerably familiar. We, however, who are in these classes would cheerfully admit that Mr. Barnes has done an excellent job in marshalling and popularizing this information. Likewise his summing up of the achievements of modern science is most useful, even for those of us who do not need it for our own religious thinking. More particularly is one impressed with all that he has to say of the new astrophysics, both where it takes us out into the infinite stellar spaces, as well as into the infinitesimal units of the composition of matter. Such summarizing as is done here constitutes a mine of information which any reader may well be grateful for. But here again, your reviewer cannot help wishing that Professor Barnes were a bit more sympathetic toward metaphysics and even that awful thing, epistemology. In recounting the wonders of the universe, especially the explorations of the astronomers, he states that the universe is not understandable, meaning of course in its infinities of space, and its other mysteries. By implication I suppose he would agree with the psalmist, "Who by searching can find out God?" But would he maintain that we do not understand it *as far as we have gone?* If not, then he accepts the validity of human knowledge. The human mind is an instrument which is capable of reaching knowledge of reality. Assuming that Einstein's conclusions will stand the severe criticism which his fellow scientists will make of them, has he not to that extent *understood* the universe? If that is conceded, does he not stand forth as in a sense greater than his own discoveries? But more important than that, does not

*The Twilight of Christianity, by Harry Elmer Barnes. Published by the Vanguard Press.

another truth emerge, namely that all this magnificent structure which has been built up by modern scientists depends entirely upon the validity of human thinking, that it can be depended on to give us true pictures of reality? that therefore the human mind runs parallel with the ways in which the universe is making progress, or at least motion? To the extent then to which human thinking goes out into its world it is not mocked, and is justified in its belief that the universe is intelligible. Professor Barnes says that Einstein's most important conclusion is that the universe is energy. Einstein's mind is so far as we know one of the manifestations of that energy. Does one stultify oneself on the one hand, or unduly magnify himself on the other, if he should guess that human thought comes as near to being the essential quality of this universal energy as anything that has so far come to our ken?

I especially like the chapter on Jesus, and particularly our author's genial criticism of those among the devout Modernists who still are attempting to settle their ethical and religious problems by reference to the unique or outstanding personality of Jesus. Rightly he maintains that they only befog any ethical issue by bringing it to the test of Jesus's teaching. And again when he says that any such evaluation of Jesus's teaching and character is but a projection of their own, which they have identified with that of Jesus. Perhaps I am especially sympathetic to this point of view because, like Professor Barnes, I lingered at that halfway house a good while. Some of UNITY's readers may be interested to know that the man who more than any other showed me it was not a permanently habitable abiding place was that honored friend of UNITY, Charles F. Dole. Another friend, who long ago gave up the historicity of Jesus once said to me "Just what would you set down as the achievements of Jesus that entitle him to be called great?" If Klausner is right in his contention that all of Jesus's teachings can be found in other Hebrew writings before him, just what has he brought into human life that can be set down in a list of his achievements? It might be a useful exercise for the devout Modernists to undertake. I gave it up some time ago.

What of the future, and of Professor Barnes's statement that the Unitarian Humanists seem to have the religion that most nearly fills the requirements of the coming time? He says he is no prophet, and we are not. Of one thing I believe with him we may be sure. Supernaturalism as ordinarily understood, with its concomitant revelation, must and will fade into twilight as the new knowledge gradually makes its way into the common consciousness. A word of warning, perhaps, is needed and I close with a quotation from Gilbert Murray:

> The great thing to remember is that the mind of man cannot be enlightened permanently by merely teaching him to reject some particular set of superstitions. There is an infinite supply of other superstitions always at hand; and the mind that desires such things, the mind that has not trained itself to the hard discipline of reasonableness and honesty, will, as soon as its devils are cast out proceed to fill itself with their relations.

JAMES H. FAIRLEY.

Correspondence

Where Is the Publisher Who "Dares"

Editor of UNITY: Dr. Strong's article in UNITY this week (December 30), has my cordial approval and unbounded applause. Dr. Strong doesn't need my appreciation, but I send it all the same. *The Man with the Sword* has met his match.

From the appended lines you will see that I did not wait for him. They were printed in UNITY twenty-two years ago (issue of July 25, 1907), and have been quoted a few times, when any one "dared." In many brief pieces since, I have been pounding away to the same effect.

I have wished I could induce some venturesome publisher of good standing to put my peace-poems into a volume. They would make a book of 150 pages or more, and would furnish abundant forceful matter for quotation at peace meetings. I have offered them during several years to some of the best publishers, and they have all been afraid. They admire their poetic value, but— "The world isn't ripe for them," or "Such a book would injure our business." Some day I may be able to find a publisher who "dares."

Phoenix, Ariz. JAMES H. WEST.

No More

No more the world lifts laurel-leaves to crown
The wielder of the battle-axe and spear.
The trade that filled the earth with fear
And robbed the mother of her hard-won prize—
Her baby with the golden hair and eyes
Just grown to manhood, fit for fair renown—
The trade that wrecked with woe
Wide fields all billowy with ripened grain,
And turned the rivers' healing flow
To currents red with wrathful stain—
That trade is passing from the earth.
No longer entered on with mirth,
War now is known
As thing the most obscene
'Mong all the things terrene;
A shame to be outgrown,
Unmasked in all its evil mien;
And conquerors are but butchers whose red hands
No more triumphant wave through cheering lands,
But nerveless fall at love's divine commands.

J. H. W.

The Administration and the Farmer

Editor of UNITY: The American farmer is in a sad plight. The total value of farm crops allows an average net income of only about $540 for his year's labor and 4½% interest on his invested capital. Remembering how our tariff system, by adding to the cost of the things he must buy, has taken heavy toll from his scant income to swell the fortunes of the Grundy group, we cannot wonder at his bitter mood.

After promising eighteen months ago to restore him to an equal economic footing with the manufacturer, our tariff-makers started in last summer to give him another frisking. Fortunately there were in the Senate some "sons of wild jackasses" who blocked the game for the present. What of the farmer's prospects for the future?

With all due respect for President Hoover's sincere efforts, only meager benefits can be expected from the Farm Board's plan to extend co-operative marketing. The same is true of the tariffs on those farm products of which we export a surplus. It is easy enough for a small group of manufacturers in one line to get together and agree to maintain high prices at home, while selling their surplus abroad and pro-rating the loss, if any; but it is quite impracticable for a million farmers to do so. Another plan of help must be found if the farmer is to be put on an equal footing.

Another plan, indeed, has been found. It is the debenture, which independents in the Senate have tacked on the tariff bill, and which the Grundy group are sure to oppose to the last ditch. They will oppose it for the very reason that it would raise the farmer to equal economic opportunities with themselves.

The debenture is simply a bonus to be paid on farm

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

THE SOCIAL NOTE AT THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

I was not "the official reporter" of the American Unitarian Association at the Biennial Conference in Chicago last October, despite the fact that I was so designated in one daily newspaper. I did represent the denominational paper and contributed several news articles to other papers. Naturally I kept my eyes and ears open not only in the meetings where we listened to the set programs, but also in the corridors and at the informal gatherings where ministers and delegates casually met. Making a diagnosis, or analysis, of all heard and observed, I should say that the big thing of the Conference was the social note which appears in no official report, and may be concealed in a variety of interests which are legitimate in such gatherings.

It was heard at the first evening meeting when that giant of human sympathy and understanding, Prof. James Mullenbach, spoke; that same Mullenbach of whom Frank L. Hayes wrote,

"Employer and employee put equal trust
In one who won't let brain or conscience rust."

He is a professor in Chicago University, a member of the Chicago school board, chairman of a joint clothing trade board, etc., etc. He spoke on, "Modern Industry in Relation to Religion." In a masterly way he pointed out the contrast between the highly specialized industry of today and the old "domestic" type. The new industrial organization, like the United States Steel Corporation, employs four hundred thousand workers in fifteen states. In the old days of the home industries and small factories, the young man who wished to learn a trade spent an apprenticeship of three or four years coming in close contact with his employer, often living in his home, going to the same church, and being in many ways on terms of social equality, often marrying his employer's daughter and eventually taking over the business. The worker knew his boss and his fellow craftsmen. What can the head of the United States Steel Corporation in a New York office possibly know about Mike Sibensky, who works for the firm in Gary, Indiana? Here we have the key of the whole situation. Industry has become depersonalized. There is no personal point of contact between the employer and the worker except the pay envelope.

A great change has taken place also in the methods of production. Formerly a man or woman was hired to tend a machine with little regard for quantity of production. Now the piece-work system is in vogue, and this is to be said,—piece-work produces a desire to work, because the greater the amount of work turned off, the greater the amount of wages received. This has been an incentive to self-interest and has caused greater efficiency in producing quantity. The fast man sets the pace, and the slower worker tries to equal his output. It means speed in production. The new type of industry puts the individual to one task, one kind of work. To sit and make buttonholes in a clothing factory all day destroys the creative impulse."

Prof. Mullenbach told the story of an old time tailor bringing to him with pride a suit which he had made with his own hands, but today the tailor has no special pride in making a suit which is not a credit to his particular skill. A factory suit goes through one hundred and fifty hands before it goes to the purchaser. Can you imagine what it means to sit day after day, year after year, and sew on buttons? It is repression of the creative instinct. Such work is monotonous, and monotony means the suppression of the human spirit. The trouble with our business today is that it is organized on the autocratic principle. An autocrat cannot know the truth. Those who work under autocrats cannot make their needs known without endangering their positions.

What is this "labor struggle" about which we hear so much? It is the struggle between Labor, collectively, and Capital. Power is never given; it is taken. No employer ought to surrender power unless labor is strong enough to force him to do so. If labor is not strong enough to take power, it is not fit to administer it. The real problem of labor is what to do with power when it gets it. The reason that labor wants power is that it wants opportunity of expression. We must not forget that the workers are the people. Labor is not a commercial problem, it is an ethical problem. Success in labor depends upon having an ideal, a standard. A labor agreement is a labor constitution. It sets forth the rights of both sides.

"Labor and the church join in recognizing human value and human worth. Our objectives should coincide."

Another social note was heard in the address of Rev. Ernest F. Tittle of Evanston, Ill., at the ministers' luncheon. Dr. Tittle put an entirely new interpretation upon the place of machinery in the industrial life of the day. His contention was that machinery is an instrument of emancipation from the slavery of human drudgery and rightly handled should give greater opportunity for human freedom by shortening the hours of labor and giving more time for the cultural and emotional life of man.

The meeting at the Uptown Temple saw the high tide of social expression in the two splendid addresses given by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison and Anna Garlin Spencer. Mrs. Spencer's address dealt with the family, the church, the state, the school and the industrial order. In the spirit of youth and with the ripeness of age, Mrs. Spencer swept her audience with a wave of enthusiasm. With eloquence and enthusiasm she handled without reserve the great, vital problems involved in the relations of the human activities cited above, and for the time at least one might have thought that he was in an audience of youthful radicals rather than in the gathering of one of the most socially conservative religious organizations in America.

Rev. Charles Clayton Morrison, of Chicago, followed Mrs. Spencer with an impassioned appeal for international peace. At the close of his address and at the adjournment of the meeting the writer had the opportunity of checking up the impression made by Dr. Morrison. As he came out a fellow minister said, "Wasn't that great? I have never been so moved by any address in my life." Going to a basement room, he found a group of business men smoking, and the reaction expressed there was as follows: "What did you think of it?" "Nothing to it," was the reply, "all very pretty, but it won't work." "Sure it won't," said another, "there will always be war, and the way to meet it is to be ready when it comes," and a dozen men grunted approval.

The most significant thing in the whole gathering, however, was the meeting of the "Social Adjustment" group in a special conference under the leadership of Robert C. Dexter, and the presentation of their findings at the General Conference.

There was a frank description of industrial conditions in both North and South. Mr. Dexter related his experiences in New Bedford at the time

---

products that are exported. It would have the effect of raising prices on farm products in the home market by the amount of the bonus. In principle it differs in no wise from the tariff, which is a device to enable the manufacturer to collect a bonus from us. The recent bill passed by Congress to give ship owners a bonus is also based on the same principle, though a still different form is used. Its purpose is to encourage American ship building, and it is viewed with satisfaction by the group of manufacturers who can see nothing but disaster in a bonus on farm exports.

They say the latter would mean terrific over-production. Think of terrific over-production of food stuffs in a world where literally hundreds of millions of people are on short rations.

What it would do would be to draw a great horde of unemployed, penniless men from the cities back to the land and set them to work. It should bring about tariff reform also. Through the clarifying discussion that would be aroused, our voters would come to see the true nature of our "protective" system. It should soon bring a scaling down of tariffs and bonuses. But the farmer would not mind. He is not asking special privileges but only equal treatment.

F. S. Kinder.

of the strike among the cotton workers, and there was an intense interest showed in the encroachment upon the rights of the workers in the textile areas of the Carolinas, encroachments on the civil, social, religious, and literary liberties of the American people. The activities of the American Civil Liberties union were indorsed. A protest was made that when a Unitarian group wished to have a discussion of the subject of Birth Control in Boston last May, civil power usurped the rights of free speech as provided by the Constitution of the United States, the civil authorities being encouraged by religious bigots. The group adopted a resolution reading, "We uphold the southern workers in their efforts to organize," and another resolution adopted which will come up at the annual May meeting is this: "We deplore the tendency to condemn an individual because of his anti-religious views and the rejection of his testimony in court because of his atheism. We deprecate the mob violence and prejudice exercised in the south against individual labor organizers and their sympathizers, and we express our condemnation of the low wages paid workers in the south by both southern and northern capital."

Many of the more conservative members of the Conference expressed the belief that this resolution will be killed at the May meetings, but possibly they have not reckoned with the rising tide of social interest. Whatever may be the general attitude of Unitarians, the social note expressed at this Conference was more clear and determined than has been heard for years, and it may be prophetic as well as traditional for the Unitarian church.

GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON.

MARK SULLIVAN ON WET AND DRY LOBBIES

Mark Sullivan knows about lobbies. Among many interests clamoring for his support, he writes in the New York *Herald Tribune* that he "is frequently lobbied by agents of the Anti-Saloon League and on the other side by the lawyers for liquor interests who would like to have prohibition changed. The liquor lawyers wear the more expensive clothes and live in the bigger houses. One feels they, or their employers, have—in part at least—a commercial motive. The liquor lawyers offer you expensive cigars; the Anti-Saloon League lobbyists never even offer you a cigarette. One gathers that the liquor lawyers have an expense account. The agents of the Anti-Saloon League and some of the so-called church societies are not paid any more than they could earn in any ordinary occupation. The late Wayne Wheeler, who was the general counsel—which in that case meant chiefly the lobbyist and political representative—of the Anti-Saloon League, received a salary (as we used to hear) of $7,500 a year. As things go in Washington that was not much. Wheeler could have earned two or three times as much as a lawyer in ordinary practice. . . . It was a pleasure to be lobbied by Wheeler. He was a sincere devotee of prohibition. But his earnestness didn't stick out to the suppression of more ordinary and human qualities. He wasn't smug or prim or sanctimonious, or arrogant, or intolerant—as some other of the prohibition workers occasionally are. He was a jolly man who could laugh and tell stories and take pleasure in a good phrase or an apt retort. . . ."

The Christian Herald.

The Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE AT PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

JANUARY
Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.
Schumann & Co. Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE
Her Right to Freedom and a Place Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.
Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's Mother India."

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: "India in Bondage easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."